



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,229	08/08/2001	Ruth E. Rosenholtz	108762	9873
27074	7590	09/23/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/682,229	ROSENHOLTZ ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kyle R Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) 39 and 40 is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ✓
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 30/11/01, 19/4/62, 11/8/02 ✓
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed 8 August 2001, and the Information Disclosure Statements filed 30 November 2001, 19 April 2002, and 1 August 2002.
2. Claims 1-42 are pending. Claims 1, 16, 20, 21, and 38 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 39-40 are objected to because of the following informalities: It is unclear to the examiner what the applicant intends to claim.

As per claim 39 the examiner suggests amending the claim 39 to read:

The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising a display device.

Appropriate correction is required.

As per claim 40 is objected to based on its dependence upon claim 39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 17 and 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per dependent claim 17 the applicant discloses, "modifying the appearance of at least one element" in reference to claim 16. However, claim 16 contains two instances where separate modifications of "at least one element" are required. This claim is indefinite because the examiner is unable to discern which "at least one element" is to be modified.

As per dependent claims 22 and 25-27 the applicant discloses "the document format modifier."

As per dependent claims 23-24 and 28-33 the applicant discloses "the image modifier."

However, these claims are dependent upon independent claim 21 which discloses an apparatus comprising "at least one of (a) a document format modifier that modifies an appearance of at least one visible element of a plurality of elements of a document while the at least one element is in a document format, and (b) an image modifier that modifies an appearance of at least one visible element in the reduced-size representation."

Since claim 21 is written in the alternate format, the apparatus may have either element (a) or element (b). Therefore, the applicant cannot have dependent claims based upon an element that is not required. This renders claims 22, 25, and 26 indefinite.

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Section 2100 of the MPEP states:

b) Nonfunctional Descriptive Material

Descriptive material that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter and should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Thus, Office personnel should consider the claimed invention as a whole to determine whether the necessary functional interrelationship is provided.

Where certain types of descriptive material, such as music, literature, art, photographs and mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data, are merely stored so as to be read or outputted by a computer without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing processes performed by the computer, then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer. Such "descriptive material" is not a process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter. (Data consists of facts, which become information when they are seen in context and convey meaning to people. Computers process data without any understanding of what that data represents. Computer Dictionary 210 (Microsoft Press, 2d ed. 1994).)

The policy that precludes the patenting of nonfunctional descriptive material would be easily frustrated if the same descriptive material could be patented when claimed as an article of manufacture. For example, music is commonly sold to consumers in the format of a compact disc. In such cases, the known compact disc acts as nothing more than a carrier for nonfunctional descriptive material. The purely nonfunctional descriptive material cannot alone provide the practical application for the manufacture.

Office personnel should be prudent in applying the foregoing guidance. Nonfunctional descriptive material may be claimed in combination with other functional descriptive multi-media material on a computer-readable medium to provide the necessary functional and structural interrelationship to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. The presence of the claimed nonfunctional descriptive material is not necessarily determinative of nonstatutory subject matter. For example, a computer that recognizes a particular grouping of musical notes read from memory and upon recognizing that particular sequence, causes another defined series of notes to be played, defines a functional interrelationship among that data and the computing processes performed when utilizing that data, and as such is statutory because it implements a statutory process.

As per claims 41-42, "an information storage medium on which is recorded a program" is not directed to statutory subject matter. The claims therefore fail to meet the requirements of U.S.C. 101, and are subsequently rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-12 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogden et al. (Document thumbnail visualizations for rapid relevance judgments: When do they pay off?).

As per independent claim 1, Ogden discloses a method for generating an enhanced thumbnail associated with a document comprising:

- Obtaining a document comprising a plurality of elements (page 1, paragraph 1: Here, document thumbnails are described and the selection of documents is discussed.)
- Generating a reduced-size representation of the document (page 1, paragraph 2: Here, the thumbnail view of documents is discussed with several advantages of the view)
- Modifying an appearance of at least one visible element of the plurality of elements relative to other visible elements of the plurality of elements in the reduced size representation (page 2, Figure 1)

As per dependent claim 2 Ogden discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one visible element comprises modifying the appearance of

the at least one visible element while in a document format (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view: Here, the visible elements have been highlighted maintains its original size while other text has been obscured).

As per dependent claim 3, Ogden discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one visible element includes modifying at least one of size, color, and font of the at least one visible element relative to other visible elements of the plurality of elements (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view: Here, the visible elements have maintained their original size while other text has a decreased font size).

As per dependent claim 4, Ogden discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one visible element comprises overlaying an overlay element on or near the reduced-size representation in association with the at least one visible element (page 2, Figure 1: Here, in both document views an overlay highlights the visible element).

As per dependent claim 5, Ogden discloses the method wherein the overlay element comprises one or more of an enlarged version of the visible element, a highlighted version of the visible element, a zoom of the visible element, a callout visibly connected with the visible element, a blurry text version of the visible element, a perspective text version of the visible element, and an arrow pointing to the visible element (page 2, Figure 1: Here, in both document views, an overlay highlights the visible element).

As per dependent claim 6, Ogden discloses the method further comprising identifying at least one element of the plurality of elements as an important element,

wherein modifying the appearance of at least one visible element comprises modifying the appearance of the important element (page 1, paragraph 3, sentence 2: Here, an area of current interest is an important element; page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view: Here, the important element and surrounding elements maintain their original size while other areas have their text decreased in size. Further, the important element is highlighted with an overlay).

As per dependent claim 7, Ogden discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of the important element comprises overlaying a modified version of the important element on or near the reduced size representation (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view: Here, the important element maintains its original size in the view while other elements have a reduced size).

As per dependent claim 8, Ogden discloses the method wherein the modified version of the important element is overlaid as a semi-transparent overlay that allows an underlying portion of the reduced-size representation to be partially visible (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view: Here, the overlay allows for elements other than the important element to be seen).

As per dependent claim 9, Ogden discloses the method wherein the important element includes one or more of a header of the document and a keyword input by a user (page 2).

As per dependent claim 10 Ogden discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one visible element comprises modifying the appearance of the at least one visible element while in a document format (page 2, Figure 1, multiple

fish-eye view: Here, the visible elements have been highlighted maintains its original size while other text has been obscured).

As per dependent claim 11, Ogden discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one visible element includes modifying at least one of size, color, and font of the at least one visible element relative to other visible elements of the plurality of elements (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view: Here, the visible elements have maintained their original size while other text has a decreased font size).

As per dependent claim 12, Ogden discloses a method wherein the at least one visible element comprises first and second visible elements, further comprising determining relevance of the first and second elements, the first visible element being determined to have a higher relevance than the second visible element, wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one element comprises modifying the first visible element with a different modification than the second visible element (page 2, Figure 1: Here, several visible elements are shown. For example, one option for the first visible element is "Research" while an option for the second visible element is "Laboratory." The first visible element, "Research," is determined to have a higher relevance than the second visible element, "Laboratory," and both are shown with different modification. The first visible element, "Research," is highlighted while the second visible element, "Laboratory," is merely shown in a font size allowing it to be read).

As per independent claim 16, Ogden discloses a method for generating an enhanced thumbnail of a document comprising:

- Obtaining a document comprising a plurality of elements (page 1, paragraph 1)
- Modifying an appearance of at least one visible element of the plurality of elements in the document (page 2, Figure 1)
- Generating a reduced-size representation associated with the document, in which the modified at least one element retains a modified appearance relative to other elements of the document (page 1, paragraph 2)
- Modifying an appearance of at least one of the plurality of elements in the reduced-size representation after generating the reduced-size representation (page 1, paragraph 3, sentence 7: Here, the areas that are returned to a normal sized font are modified after the generating the reduced-size representation)

As per dependent claim 17, Ogden discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of at least one element of a plurality of elements in the reduced-size representation comprises modifying the at least one element that was modified prior to reducing the image (page 2, Figure 1).

As per dependent claim 18, Ogden discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of at least one element of a plurality of elements in the reduced-size representation comprises modifying an element that was not modified prior to reducing the image (page 1, paragraph 3).

As per dependent claim 19, Ogden discloses the method wherein the reduced-sized representation is a reduced image (page 1, paragraph 1).

As per independent claim 20, Ogden discloses the method for generating an enhanced thumbnail associated with a document comprising:

- Obtaining a document comprising a plurality of elements (page 1, paragraph 1)
- Generating a reduced image of the document (page 2, Figure 1)
- Modifying an appearance of at least one visible element of the plurality of elements relative to other elements of the plurality of visible elements in the reduced-size representation (page 1, paragraph 3; page 2, Figure 1)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogden in further view of Chiou et al. (Perceptual Thumbnail).

As per dependent claim 13, Ogden discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden fails to specifically disclose the method wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one element comprises modifying an appearance of the reduced-size representation as a whole. However, Chiou discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one element comprises modifying an appearance of the reduced-size representation as a whole (page 2, Fig 1; page 3, Text-to-strike substitution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden and Angiulo's apparatus for generating enhanced thumbnails with Chiou's method of modifying the appearance of the reduced-size image, since it would have allowed the user to focus on important elements that have been modified to emphasize importance while ignoring less important elements that have been modified so as to not divert a user's attention from important elements.

11. Claim 21-30 and 34-42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogden in further view of Angiulo et al. (U.S. 6,275,829).

As per independent claim 21, Ogden discloses the apparatus for generating an enhanced thumbnail associated with a document comprising at least one of (a) document format modifier that modifies an appearance of at least one visible element of a plurality of elements of a document while the at least one element is in a document format, and (b) an image modifier that modifies an appearance of at least one visible element in the reduced-size representation (page 1, paragraph 2; page 2, Figure 1). Ogden fails to specifically disclose a renderer that generates a reduced-size representation of the document. However, Angiulo discloses a renderer that generates a reduced-size representation of the document (column 5, lines 26-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden's apparatus for generating an enhanced thumbnail with Angiulo's method of rendering reduced-size representations of documents, since it would have allowed a user to download information more quickly

and still have the information of the original document communicated (Angiulo: column 5, lines 38-41).

As per dependent claim 22, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the document format modifier modifies the appearance of the at least one visible element by modifying at least one of size, color, and font of the at least one visible element relative to other elements of the plurality of visible elements (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view).

As per dependent claim 23, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the image modifier modifies the appearance of the at least one visible element in the reduced-size representation by overlaying an overlay element on or near the reduced size representation in association with the at least one visible element (page 2, Figure 1).

As per dependent claim 24, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 23, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the overlay element comprises one or more of an enlarged version of the visible element, a highlighted version of the visible element, a zoom of the visible element, a callout visibly connected with the visible element, a blurry text version of the visible element, a perspective text version of the visible element, and an arrow pointing to the visible element (page 2, Figure 1).

As per dependent claims 25 and 28, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein at least one element of the plurality of visible elements is identified as an important element, and the appearance of the important element is modified (page 1, paragraph 3, sentence 2; page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view).

As per dependent claim 26, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 25, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the document format modifier modifies the appearance of the important element by modifying at least one of size, color and font of the important element relative to other elements of the plurality of visible elements (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view).

As per dependent claim 27, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 25, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the important element includes one or more of a header of the document and a keyword input by a user (page 2).

As per dependent claim 29, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 28, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the image modifier modifies the appearance of the important element by overlaying a modified version of the important element on or near the reduced size representation (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view).

As per dependent claim 30, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 29, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the modified version of the important element is overlaid as a semi-transparent overlay that allows an underlying portion of the reduced-size representation to be partially visible (page 2, Figure 1, multiple fish-eye view).

As per dependent claim 34, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus including both the document format modifier and the image modifier (page 2, Figure 1).

As per dependent claim 35, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 34, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the at least one visible element modified in the document format and the at least one visible element modified in the reduced-size representation are the same element (page 2, Figure 1).

As per dependent claim 36, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 34, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the at least one visible element modified in the reduced-size representation are different elements (page 2, Figure 1; page 1, paragraph 3: Here, the users can modify the document format by clicking on areas that are not currently areas of interest. The document format would then change to show these areas of interest, while the reduced-sized format would remain the same).

As per dependent claim 37, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the reduced-size representation is a reduced image (page 4, paragraph 2).

As per independent claim 38, Ogden discloses the apparatus for generating an enhanced thumbnail associated with a document comprising at least one of (a) document format modifier that modifies an appearance of at least one visible element of a plurality of elements of a document while the at least one element is in a document format, and (b) an image modifier that modifies an appearance of at least one visible element in the reduced-size representation (page 1, paragraph 2; page 2, Figure 1). Ogden fails to specifically disclose a renderer that generates a reduced image of the document. However, Angiulo discloses a renderer that generates a reduced image of the document (column 5, lines 26-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden's apparatus for generating an enhanced thumbnail with Angiulo's method of rendering reduced image of documents, since it would have allowed a user to download information more quickly and still have the information of the original document communicated (Angiulo: column 5, lines 38-41).

As per dependent claim 39, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus including a display device (page 1, paragraph 3: Here, in order for the document viewer to work properly, there must be a display device).

As per dependent claim 40, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 39, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden further discloses the apparatus wherein the display device is one of a file browser device, an email browser, a hierarchy browser, a system that displays thumbnails of applications of a personal computer, and a handheld device (page 1, paragraph 3).

As per dependent claim 41 Ogden discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden fails to specifically disclose an information storage medium on which a program is recorded. However, Angiulo discloses an information storage medium on which a program is recorded (claim 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden's method with Angiulo's information storage medium, since it would have allowed a user to store the method.

As per dependent claim 42 Ogden discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden fails to specifically disclose an information storage medium on which a program is recorded. However, Angiulo discloses an information storage medium on which a program is recorded (claim 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden's method with Angiulo's information storage medium, since it would have allowed a user to store the method.

12. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogden and Chiou in further view of Blumberg (U.S. 6,708,309).

As per dependent claim 14 Ogden and Chiou disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden and Chiou fail to disclose the method wherein modifying an appearance of the reduced-size representation as a whole comprises modifying the contrast of the reduced-size representation. However, Blumberg discloses modifying the contrast of image data (column 10, lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden and Chiou's method of modifying the appearance of a reduced-size representation with Blumberg's method of modifying the contrast, since it would have allowed a user to have some elements appear sharper than others.

As per dependent claim 15, Ogden, Chiou, and Blumberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 14, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Blumberg further discloses the method wherein modifying contrast comprises applying a color wash to the reduced-size representation (column 10, lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden, Chiou, and Blumberg's method of modifying the contrast of a reduced-size representation with Blumberg's method of applying a color wash, since it would have allowed a user to have some elements appear sharper than others.

Art Unit: 2178

13. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogden and Angiulo in further view of Chiou et al.

As per dependent claim 31, Ogden and Angiulo disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden and Angiulo fail to disclose the apparatus wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one element comprises modifying an appearance of the reduced-size representation as a whole. However, Chiou discloses the method wherein modifying the appearance of the at least one element comprises modifying an appearance of the reduced-size representation as a whole (page 2, Fig 1; page 3, Text-to-strike substitution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden and Angiulo's apparatus for generating enhanced thumbnails with Chiou's method of modifying the appearance of the reduced-size image, since it would have allowed the user to focus on important elements that have been modified to emphasize importance while ignoring less important elements that have been modified so as to not divert a user's attention from important elements.

14. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogden, Angiulo, and Chiou in further view of Blumberg.

As per dependent claim 32 Ogden, Angiulo, and Chiou disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 31, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogden, Angiulo, and Chiou fail to disclose the method wherein modifying an appearance of the reduced-size representation as a whole comprises modifying the contrast of the

reduced-size representation. However, Blumberg discloses modifying the contrast of image data (column 10, lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden, Angiulo, and Chiou's method of modifying the appearance of a reduced-size representation with Blumberg's method of modifying the contrast, since it would have allowed a user to have some elements appear sharper than others.

As per dependent claim 33, Ogden, Angiulo, Chiou, and Blumberg disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 32, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Blumberg further discloses the method wherein modifying contrast comprises applying a color wash to the reduced-size representation (column 10, lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogden, Angiulo, Chiou, and Blumberg's method of modifying the contrast of a reduced-size representation with Blumberg's method of applying a color wash, since it would have allowed a user to have some elements appear sharper than others.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Feinberg (US 2002/0143825): Discloses rendering.
- Weber (US 2002/0124026): Discloses modifying text size to increase reading speed and comprehension.

- Dutta et al. (US 2002/0111974): Discloses emphasized regions of a web page.
- Miller (US 2002/0010718): Discloses displaying reduced-sized document representations.
- Brown et al. (US 6665838): Discloses thumbnails with complimentary information.
- Miller (US 6613100): Discloses displaying reduced-size documents in alternative viewing selections.
- Ishimaru (US 6427155): Discloses document display and recording medium.
- Golovchinsky et al. (US 6128634): Discloses a method and apparatus for skimming text.
- Hayashi (US 5918238): Discloses a document processing apparatus which evaluates elements and changes the color/format of the document to satisfy user parameters.
- Rowe et al. (US 5860074): Discloses displaying an electronic document with text and object overlaps.
- Rowe et al. (US 5819301): Discloses a method and apparatus for reading multi-page electronic documents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER